Pamph.
Eng. Lit.
F

LIBRARY
NOV 9 1907
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

3 1761 09343519 6

# Henry Fielding's
# Don Quixote in England

INAUGURAL-DISSERTATION

ZUR

ERLANGUNG DER DOKTORWÜRDE

DER

HOHEN PHILOSOPHISCHEN FAKULTÄT

DER

UNIVERSITÄT BERN

VORGELEGT

VON

**Ernst Dolder**

von Flawyl (St. Gallen).

ZÜRICH

Buchdruckerei Gebr. Leemann & Co.

Verlag der „Academia".

1907.

Henry Fielding's

# Don Quixote in England

INAUGURAL-DISSERTATION

ZUR

ERLANGUNG DER DOKTORWÜRDE

DER

HOHEN PHILOSOPHISCHEN FAKULTÄT

DER

UNIVERSITÄT BERN

VORGELEGT

VON

**Ernst Dolder**

von Flawyl (St. Gallen).

ZÜRICH

Buchdruckerei Gebr. Leemann & Co.

Verlag der „Academia".

1907.

Von der philosophischen Fakultät auf Antrag des Herrn Prof. Dr. MÜLLER-HESS angenommen.

Bern, den 23. Juni 1906.

Der Dekan:
Prof. Dr. G. Huber.



Meinen lieben Eltern





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/henryfieldingsdo00dold

# Contents.


I. Bibliographical Index.
II. Don Quixote in universal literature.
III. Chronology of English translations and imitations of Cervantes' Don Quixote.
IV. Fielding's admiration for Cervantes.
V. Fielding's "Don Quixote in England":
a) Dedication, preface and introduction,
b) Summary of the play,
c) Characters and sources.
VI. Fielding and Walpole.
VII. Fielding's attempt as a dramatical writer.

# I. Bibliographical Index.


Adams, A dictionary of the drama, London 1904.
Addison, Sir Roger de Coverley (from "The Spectator"), London 1711—12.
Baker, Biographia dramatica, London 1812.
Becker, Die Aufnahme des Don Quixote in die englische Literatur, Palaestra XIII, Berlin 1906.
Beljame, Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au 18e siècle, Paris 1897.
Cervantes, El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha, Madrid 1605.
Cervantes, Segunda parte del ingenioso cavallero Don Quijote de la Mancha, Madrid 1615.
Chalmers, Bibliographical Dictionary, London 1812.
Chesterfield, Characters of eminent personages of his own time, London 1777.
Coleridge, Literary Remains, London 1836.
Coxe, Memoirs of the life and administration of Sir Robert Walpole, London 1798.
Dibdin, A complete history of the English stage, London 1800.
Dobson, Henry Fielding, New-York 1900.
Dorer, Cervantes und seine Werke in Deutschland, Leipzig 1881.
Ewald, Sir Robert Walpole, London 1878.
Genest, Some account of the English stage, Bath 1832.
Gosse, The works of Henry Fielding, Westminster 1898.
Hayward, Lord Chesterfield, London 1854.
Hazlitt, A manual for the collector and amateur of old English plays, London 1892.
Hazlitt, Lectures on the English comic writers, London 1819.
Hervey, Memoirs of the reign of George II, London 1848.
Hettner, Literaturgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts, Braunschweig 1894.
Juleville, Petit de, Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française, Paris 1896.
Keightley, On the life and writings of Henry Fielding (in Fraser's Magazine), London 1858.

Kölbing, Englische Studien, Heilbronn 1877.
Lawrence, The life of Henry Fielding, London 1855.
Lindner, Henry Fielding's dramatische Werke, Leipzig und Dresden 1895.
Macaulay, Comic dramatists of the Restoration, New-York 1861.
Macklin, Memoirs, London 1804.
Mahon, The letters of P. D. Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, London 1845—53.
Maynadier, The works of Henry Fielding, Cambridge U. S. 1905.
Molière, L'Avare, Paris 1669.
Molière, Œuvres, Paris 1682.
Montagu, Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, London 1861.
Murphy, The works of Henry Fielding, London 1762.
Péronne, Ueber englische Zustände im 18. Jahrhundert nach den Romanen von Fielding und Smollett, Leipzig 1890.
Roscoe, The works of Henry Fielding, London 1840.
Saintsbury, The works of Henry Fielding, London 1893.
Sharp, Dictionary of English authors, London 1904.
Scott, Biographical memoirs, Edinburgh 1841.
Stephen, Dictionary of national biography, London 1889.
Stephen, The works of Henry Fielding, London 1882.
Thackeray, The English humorists of the 18 th century, London 1853.
Ticknor, History of the Spanish literature, Boston 1888.
Viardot, Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Cervantes, Paris 1837.
Waller, The imperial dictionary of universal biography, London 1857—63.
Walpole, The letters of Horace Walpole, London 1857.
Walpole, Memoirs of the reign of George II, London 1848—51.
Watson, Life of Henry Fielding, London 1807.
Wiese e Pèrcopo, Storia della letteratura italiana, Torino 1900.

## II.

## Don Quixote in Universal Literature.

A. W. Schlegel, the famous Shakespeare-translator, says in one of his writings: "Don Quixote" is the perfect masterpiece of higher romantic art". Indeed, there are few works in universal literature more worthy of their fame than the great novel of Cervantes. All over the world we find translations and imitations of "Don Quixote", testifying of the high popularity he enjoys with all peoples and nations. To give an idea of its growing fame, I should like to pass in review the most important editions, translations and imitations of the book.

The first edition of the *First Part* of "Don Quixote" was printed with this title: „El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha, compuesto por Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, dirigido al Duque de Bejar, Marques de Gibraleon etc. Año 1605. Con Privilegio, etc. En Madrid, por Juan de la Cuesta", 4° in one volume.

Three editions more appeared in the same year, namely one at Madrid, one at Lisbon, and the other at Valencia. These with another at Brussels, in 1607 — five in all — are the only editions that appeared

till he took it in hand to correct some of its errors. Such corrections appeared in the Madrid edition of 1608, 4°. This edition, as the only one containing Cervantes' amendments of the text, is more valued and sought after than any other, and is the basis on which all the good impressions since have been founded. After this an edition at Milan, 1610, and one at Brussels, 1611, are known to have been printed before the appearance of the second part in 1615. So that in nine or ten years there were eight editions of the First Part of Don Quixote, implying a circulation greater than that of the works of Shakespeare or Milton, Racine or Molière, who, as of the same century, may be fitly compared with Cervantes.

The first edition of the *Second Part* of Don Quixote is entitled: „Segunda Parte del Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha, por Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, autor de su primera parte, dirigida a Don Pedro Fernandez de Castro, Conde de Lemos, etc. Año 1615. Con Privilegio, en Madrid, por Juan de la Cuesta", 4°. It was printed separately, Valencia 1616, Brussels 1616, Barcelona 1617 and Lisbon 1617, after which no separate edition is known to have appeared.

Thus eight editions of the First Part were printed in ten years and five of the Second Part in two years. Both parts appeared together at Barcelona in 1617 in two volumes 12° and from this period the number of editions has been very great, both in Spain and in foreign countries, nearly fifty of them being of some consequence.

Of all these the 5 following editions may be considered the best:

1. Tonson's edition, London 1738
2. The edition of the Spanish Academy, Madrid 1780
3. Bowle's edition, Salisbury 1781
4. Pellicer's edition, Madrid 1797—98
5. Clemencin's edition, Madrid 1833—39.

In other countries the Don Quixote is hardly less known than it is in Spain. Down to the year 1700, it is curious to observe, that as many editions of the entire work were printed abroad as at home, and the succession of translations from the first has been uninterrupted.

The first *French* translation of the First Part of Don Quixote was made by Cesar Oudin and was published at Paris in 1620. The Second Part was translated by F. Rosset and was printed in 1633. In 1677 there appeared another translation by Filleau de St. Martin (here the story is materially altered, so as to permit Don Quixote to survive for other adventures). His work, left unfinished, was taken up by Robert Challes. The most read of the numerous French translations has been that of Florian (1799), though Louis Viardot's (Paris 1836—38) is a much better one.

Don Quixote has been a great favourite with *German* writers, both in the 17th and in the 18th century. Of German translations I note:

Pahsch Basteln von der Sohle, Cöthen 1621
Johann Ludwig du Four (Verleger), Genf 1682.
Fritsch (Verleger), Leipzig 1734
Frankfurter und Leipziger Übersetzung 1734—35
F. J. Bertuch, Weimar 1775
Ludwig Tieck, Berlin 1799—1801
D. W. Soltan, Königsberg 1800
Quedlinburger und Leipziger Übersetzung 1825

H. Müller, Zwickau 1825
Heinrich Heine, Stuttgart 1837 38
A. Keller und F. Notter, 1839
Edmund Zoller, Hildburghausen 1867--68.

All countries have sought the means of enjoying the Don Quixote, for there are translations in Latin, Italian, Dutch, Danish, Russian, Polish and Portuguese. But better than any of these foreign translations is the admirable one made into German by Ludwig Tieck, eight editions of which appeared between 1799 and 1876 and superseded all the other German versions. It ought to be added that in the last halfcentury more editions of the original have appeared in Germany than in any other foreign country.

As to *prose imitations* of Don Quixote, I only want to point out the most important of them:

*a)* In *Spain*:

Avellaneda ("Secundo Tomo del Ingenioso Hidalgo . . .") Tarragona 1614 [translated into French by Lesage 1704 and Germon de Lavigne 1853].
Anzarena ("Empresas Literarias del ingeniosissimo . . .") Sevilla 1767
Delgado ("Adiciones á Don Quijote") Madrid
Ribero y Larrea ("El Quijote de la Cantabria") Madrid 1792
"Historia de Sancho Panza", Madrid 1793—98
Siñeriz ("El Quijote del siglo XVIII), Madrid 1836
"Napoleon o el verdadero Don Quijote de la Europa"), Madrid 1813

*b) Out of Spain:*

Out of the great number of foreign imitations, the most valuable, according to modern critics, are:

Ward, "Life of Don Quixote, merrily translated into Hudibrastic Verse, London 1711

Wieland, "Don Sylvio von Rosalva", Ulm 1764

Meli, "Don Chisciotte", 3d and 4th volume of "Poesie Siciliane", Palermo 1787

Smollett, "Sir Launcelot Greaves", London 1762

Don Quixote has often been produced on the *stage*. There are *Spanish* plays on Don Quixote by different authors: Francisco de Avila, Guillen de Castro, Calderon (lost), Gomez Labrador, Francisco Marti, Valladares, Melendez Valdes, Ventura de la Vega.

There are several old *French* plays on Don Quixote, long since forgotten:

"Les Folies de Cardenio" by Pichot 1623

"Don Quichotte de la Manche" by Guerin de Boucal 1640

"Le Gouvernement de Sancho Panza" by B. 1642

"Le Curieux Impertinent ou le Jaloux", 1645

"Don Quichotte de la Manche", tragicomédie par C. D. 1703.

A very amusing fact concerning Don Quixote connected with the French stage is, that in a play arranged by Madeleine Bejart and called "Don Quichotte ou les Enchantements de Merlin" Molière played the part of Sancho and the ass, who had not thoroughly learned his part, came on the stage too soon in spite of his poetical rider and created a great uproar of merriment (Guimarest, Vie de Molière).

*German* plays and operas about Don Quixote have been written by:

Hinsch, Hamburg 1690

Müller, 1722

F. J. H. Soden, Berlin 1788–91

B. Schack, 1792
Dittersdorf, 1795
Heusler, Wien 1803
A. Bode, Leipzig 1804
Paul Taglioni, Berlin
A. Rubinstein, Leipzig.

All these different editions, translations and imitations, which for above two centuries have been poured out upon the different countries of Europe, give still but an imperfect idea of the kind and degree of success which the extraordinary work has enjoyed, for there are thousands and thousands who never have read it and who never heard of Cervantes, to whom nevertheless the names of Don Quixote and of Sancho are as familiar as household works.

## III.

# Chronology of English translations and imitations of Cervantes' Don Quixote.

---

No foreign country has done so much for Cervantes and Don Quixote as *England*, both by original editions published there and by translations.

As to English *translations*, the first was written by Shelton, 1612—20, which was followed by

John Philips' in 1687
Motteux's „ 1700
Ward's „ 1711—12
Jarvis' „ 1742
Smollett's „ 1755
Wilmot's „ 1774

and the anonymous one of 1818, which has adopted parts of all its predecessors.

The English *imitations* of "Don Quixote" are very numerous, as will be seen by the following chronological table:

1611 Beaumont and Fletcher's "Knight of the Burning Pestle"

1654 Edmund Gayton's "Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixote"
1656 Holland's "Don Zara del Fogo"
1663—78 Butler's "Hudibras"
1694—96 D'Urfey's "Comical History of D. Q."
1711 Edward Ward's "Life of D. Q."
1734 Fielding's "D. Q. in England"
1741 Pope's, Swift's & Arbuthnot's "Martinus Scriblerus"
1752 Mrs. Lennox's "Female Quixote"
1762 Smollett's "Sir Launcelot Greaves"
1773 Graves' "Spiritual Quixote"
1774 Piguenit's "D. Q."
1797 Cross's "Harlequin and Quixote"
1808 Moser's "D. Q. in Barcelona"
1833 Almar's "D. Q."
1846 Macfarren's "D. Q."
1867 Hazlewood's "D. Q."
1869 Killick's "D. Q."
1876 Paulton & Maltby's "D. Q."
1895 Wills' "D. Q."
1899 Percy Milton's "D. Q."

C. W. Hazlitt in his "Manual for the collector and amateur of old English plays" (London 1892) speaks of a comedy "The history of D. Q. or the Knight of the ill-favoured face advertised at the end of the New World of English Words 1658 and of Wit and Drollery 1661 as in the press, not at present known." On making inquiries, Mr Hazlitt writes me that up to the present day no further information about this play has come to his knowledge.

There are some anonymous imitations of "Don Quixote" to be mentioned, viz.:

1673 "Don Quixote Redivivus"
1678 "The Mock Clelia or Madam Quixote"
1761 "Tarrataria or Don Quixote the second".
1763 "Fizgigg or the Modern Quixote"
1785 "The Country Quixote"
1789 "The Amicable Quixote"

Of all these works Butler's "*Hudibras*" was for a long time considered the best imitation of Cervantes' hero. However it would be going too far calling it "The English Copy of Don Quixote", as Joseph Warton has done in N° 133 of the "Adventurer". Though its plan is entirely original, the leading idea may in some measure be referred to Cervantes "Don Quixote"; but as the object of Butler was totally different from that of the immortal Spanish humorist, so the execution is so modified as to leave the English work all the glory of complete novelty.

The earliest of these imitations was Beaumont and Fletcher's comedy "*The Knight of the burning pestle*" (1611). Intended as a parody on Thomas Heywood's "The four prentices of London" (1601), its principal hero, Ralph, is a second Don Quixote whose victorious struggle against the giant Barbarossa and the liberation of his prisoners are a combination of similar adventures in Cervantes (Chapter XXI and XXII). Sancho Panza is happily imitated in Tim, apprentice, and even Susan, the cobbler's maid in Milk-street, bears a certain resemblance to fair Dulcinea del Toboso.

---

## IV.

## Fielding's admiration for Cervantes.

There can scarcely be mentioned a writer of ancient or modern times who at all approaches Cervantes in the wide extent of his popularity and the universal reception which his great work has had in every portion of the civilized world.

Though Shakespeare's name is now probably a familiar one in every quarter of the globe and his works are as widely diffused as his race, still, at present no one would venture to assert that any characters of his are pictured to the eye with the same clearness as those immortal photographs of Cervantes' pen which in course of time have been transferred to almost every European literature.

Of all English poets none certainly professed a more sincere admiration for Cervantes than Fielding. There is no doubt that long before publishing his "Joseph Andrews" he admired in Cervantes the master of comic novel writing. From his boyhood he had fastened with eager delight on the immortal creations of Cervantes. They were the loadstars of his fancy, the fairy forms which had led captive his youthful

imagination. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the rude comedy "Don Quixote in England", written at Leyden in the first transports of youthful ardour, was a favourite with its author, for the idea had taken deep root in his mind. Though Fielding's principal object in the composition of "Joseph Andrews" was to caricature "Pamela" by presenting a picture of male virtue in humble life, as a ludicrous counterpart of Richardson's sketch, another and much higher design was included in his plan. He endeavoured to imitate the manner and catch a portion of the spirit of his master. To present an English parallel to the adventures of the chivalrous Don suggested itself to his mind and he created a hero calculated to afford amusement to his readers, without ever forfeiting their esteem. Upon its title-page "Joseph Andrews" is declared to be "written in imitation of the manner of Cervantes". There is no doubt that, in addition to being subjected to an unreasonable amount of ill-usage, Parson Adams has manifest affinities with Don Quixote.

Taking Fielding's ideas about the ridiculous into careful consideration, it will be easy to find out the affinities existing between these ideas and his study of Cervantes. He calls affectation the only source of the ridiculous; affectation again has its origin in vanity or hypocrisy. Fielding now goes on to say that it is just the contrast between the pretention of vain or hypocritical people and the sound reality that makes these people ridiculous. Fielding considered the "affecting false characters in order to purchase applause" as the main comic idea in Cervantes' "Don Quixote" and so he made the true copy of those human errors the object of his novel-writing. It is for

this reason that Fielding always looked at his novels as imitations of Cervantes, to whom he owes much in this regard.

It is interesting to notice that literary critics thought Fielding a worthy imitator of the great Spanish poet. Throughout Europe the fame of Fielding as a novel-writer is such as to allow him to be placed beside his great ideal Cervantes. Of all the numerous imitators and followers of Cervantes Fielding is by far the worthiest as the most original and most independent of them. The imaginative faculties as well as the knowledge of men and matters are quite his own; all, that belongs to the creating artist, is his own property. It is only in the art of composing he looks to Cervantes as his master and ideal. With regard to the leading idea he goes even farther than his model: Fielding regards the affectation based on hypocrisy as the worthiest subject to treat with. Cervantes' comic consists in putting forward human vanity, Fielding adds the study of human wretchedness with a view to the ethical side of the matter.

It would be an injustice to call Cervantes a specific Catholic and Fielding a specific Protestant poet. This to say would be to misunderstand the cause of the immortality of their work, which lies in the fact that both Cervantes and Fielding stood high above their generation. Both were national poets in the best sense of the word, but their highest aim was to represent mankind in general. Cervantes owes the depth and originality of his work to his own genius whereas Fielding is indebted for the broad-mindedness and freedom of his ideas to the uprising of civilisation and the liberal tendencies of his century.

However, if any novelist of the world deserves to stand besides Cervantes, it is certainly Fielding who in his comic novels reaches the same classical height of perfection as his master Cervantes.

## V.

## Fielding's "Don Quixote in England".

*a) Dedication, Preface and Introduction.*

In April 1734 a comedy called "Don Quixote in England" and written by Henry Fielding was acted at the New Theatre in the Hay-Market.

This comedy was begun at Leyden in the year 1728 and after it had been sketched ont into a few loose scenes was thrown by and for a long while no more thought of. "It was", says Fielding in his preface, originally written for my private amusement, as it would indeed have been little less than Quixotism itself to hope any other fruits from attempting characters wherein the inimitable Cervantes so far excelled. The impossibility of going beyond and the extreme difficulty of keeping pace with him, were sufficient to infuse despair into a very adventurous author". He soon discovered that his small experience and little knowledge of the world had led him into an error. He found it very difficult to vary tho scene and give his knight an opportunity of displaying himself in a different manner from that wherein he appears in the romance. "Human nature", says Fielding, "is everywhere the same and the modes and habits

of particular nations do not change it enough, sufficiently to distinguish a Quixote in England from a Quixote in Spain".

Booth and Cibber, then managers of Drury Lane, on examining the play of Fielding advised him not to produce it on the stage. However, on the solicitations of the "distressed actors at Drury Lane", he tried to improve it by adding some scenes in which Don Quixote is introduced to the remarkable humours of an English election. The piece was rehearsed, but it was delayed by various accidents until no longer needed at Drury Lane. Fielding's services as an author were no longer required, whilst Macklin's, his friend's engagement came to an end. Fortunately, the two friends managed to engage a small company, whereupon Fielding's "Don Quixote in England" was brought out at the New Theatre in the Hay-Market.

It may be worth while to mention that an enigmatic phrase in Fielding's preface about the "Giant Cajanus" is explained by the fact that "Mynheer Cajanus" seems to have been a Dutch actor or harlequin, who appeared as Gargantua in a piece called "Cupid and Psyche", the performance of which was one of the obstacles to the representation of "Don Quixote".

Fielding's play was dedicated to the "Right Honourable Philip Earl of Chesterfield, Knight of the most noble Order of the Garter" and author of the famous letters.

In his dedication, Fielding dwells with much complacency on the wholesome tendency of the "election scenes", which he had engrafted upon it. "The most ridiculous exhibitions of luxury or avarice", he writes, "may have little effect on the sensualist or the miser,

but I fancy a lively representation of the calamities brought on a country by general corruption might have a very sensible and useful effect on the spectators". Fielding's object was laudable enough and his exposure of electoral corruption is characterized by wit and vigour; but he must have been a Quixote indeed who could have conceived it possible that any amount of satire and sarcasm would have induced Sir Robert Walpole to have abandoned the system of wide-spread corruption by which he carried on the government of England at this period.

The Introduction to "Don Quixote in England" begins with a dialogue between manager and author. The former complains of there being no prologue to the play, whilst the audience would never do without it. That affords a good opportunity to Fielding to attack the bad use of prologues and epilogues with a certain class of play-writers. One of them begins with abusing the writing of all his contemporaries, lamenting the corrupt state of the stage and assuring the audience that this play wasw ritten with a design to restore true taste. The second is in a different cast: The first twelve lines inveigh against all indecency on the stage and the last twenty show you what it is. A third class of authors is so sensible of the demerits of their plays that they desire to set the audience asleep before they begin.

This interesting dialogue is interrupted by a player who entreats the manager to begin at once with the performance of the play, the audience making such a noise with their canes that if the actors did not begin immediately the public would surely beat down the house before the play begins. The manager then

orders to play away the overture immediately and takes leave of the author who retires to some part of the house to have a look at the performance.

*b) Summary of the play.*

Act I. Scene I.
Scene: An Inn

Guzzle, innkeeper, speeks to Sancho, squire of Don Quixote, complaining of his staying at his house without paying any retribution. He threatens to get a warrant for Don Quixote, if he did not pay at once his bill. Sancho replies that knights-errant like his master are above the law and freed from paying anything. Guzzle assures Sancho that his ass as well as his master's beast shall have no more oats at his expense; never, he says, were masters and their beasts so like another. The scene closes with an air sung by Sancho:

"Rogues there are of each nation
Except among the divines
And vinegar since the creation
Has still been made of all wines".

Scene II.

Don Quixote calls Sancho. He tells him that there has arrived at the castle (i. e. the inn) one of the most accursed giants marching at the head of his army. Sancho, astonished, says that it were but a country gentleman going a-courting and having with him a pack of dogs. Don Quixote furiously rejoins that he knows nothing about that and says that this must be the enchanter Merlin whom he knows very well by his dogs. — A sweet love-song is heard behind the doors.

Scene III.

The innkeeper comes in and tells Don Quixote that horse and ass are saddled. The latter replies that he does not want to leave him. Guzzle again asks for the payment of the bill, whereupon Don Quixote orders Sancho to pay the innkeeper a thousand English guineas. Sancho confesses not to have seen any money for a fortnight. His master won't believe it as he certainly must have got plenty of money out of the spoils of so many plundered giants. Quixote commands Sancho to present himself at once at the court of Dulcinea del Toboso.

Dorothea, a young lady and guest of the hostelry, sings within. Don Quixote addresses her as the princess of the castle whom he supposes to be held captive by a cursed enchanter. He calls out commanding the enchanter to open the castle-gates. As nothing is done he attacks the walls and breaks the windows.

Scene IV.

Guzzle enters crying out that they were beating down his house. Quixote steps forward and requires him to deliver at once the princess whom he detains to rob her of all plates and jewels. A mob is gathering round the inn laughing at the madness of Don Quixote.

Scene V—VII.

Dorothea in her chamber is seen talking to Jezebel, her maid. She is waiting for her lover, finding fault at his slowness. Sancho enters and inquires after the enchanted lady. Dorothea presents herself as the princess Indoccalambria and asks to see his illustrious master Don Quixote. Sancho entreats her to prevail on his master not to send him home to Spain after

his lady Dulcinea, as he is very fond of English roastbeef and strong beer. Now follows Sancho's famous song of the "Roast Beef of Old England"[1]):

"When mighty roast beef was the Englishman's food
In ennobled our hearts and enriched our blood
Our soldiers were brave and our courtiers were good.
O the roast beef of Old England
And Old England's roast beef!
Then, Britons, from all nice dainties refrain
Which effeminate Italy, France and Spain
And mighty roast beef shall command in the main.
O the roast beef of Old England
And Old England's roast beef!"

Dorothea hearing that Sancho had once imposed a certain lady for Dulcinea on his master, will fit out Jezebel for this purpose. Sancho says this would be the best as there were no Dulcinea to be found in Spain; he continues to tell her that he would never have followed his master if it had not been for the sake of a little island of which he was to be the governor. Dorothea charges him to inform at once Don Quixote of the arrival of his sweet lady Dulcinea del Toboso.

Scene VIII—X. A Street.

The mayor of the town accompanied by his neighbour is seen walking through the street. The mayor suggests that Don Quixote has come in town in view of the approaching parliamentary elections; he is quite convinced that he wants to buy votes to be sure of his election as a member of parliament. He fears

---

[1]) Richard Leveridge took Fielding's first verse, added others and set the whole to music (Hullah's Song Book 1866, No 39).

The first verse is also to be found in Fielding's "Grub-Street-Opera" (Air 45), which appeared in 1731.

that the corporation candidate, Sir Thomas Loveland, will meet with no opposition. He smells a plot to sell the whole town to the corporation; but rather than to suffer this he would ride all over the kingdom for a candidate. He thinks of Don Quixote as a member fit for parliament; as for his being mad, it does not matter. His neighbour is of the same opinion; though Quixote has brought no money with him, he is supposed to have a very large estate.

Guzzle the innkeeper is coming up and invites the mayor to have a drink with him. The mayor inquires about Don Quixote and informs Guzzle of his intention to propose Quixote as member of parliament. He thinks it necessary to get an opposition candidate who is ready to spend his money for the honour of his party. He adds that these times come but seldom and they ought to make the best of them. Guzzle agrees and they are going to empty a bottle in honour of the coming election.

Act II. Scene I—III.

Scene: A chamber in the inn.

Sancho, weary of the dangers of knight-errantry, begs his master to make him a landlord which seems to him a very thriving trade in England; anything, he says, would be better than to be looked upon as a madman. Don Quixote says that he is not concerned at the evil opinion of men. "If we consider who are their favourites, we shall have no reason to be so fond of their applause. Virtue is too bright for their eyes and they dare not behold her. Hypocrisy is the deity they worship. Look through the world: what is it recommends men but the poverty, the vice and the misery of others? Instead of endeavouring to make

himself better, each man endeavours to make his neighbour worse. Each man rises to admiration by treading on mankind. Sancho, let them call me mad; I am not mad enough to court their approbation."

Guzzle enters and tells Don Quixote that the mayor of the town has come to pay him a visit. Don Quixote welcomes the mayor asking him to let him know the object of his visit. The mayor says that the whole town is highly sensible of the honour he intends them. He assures him of the entire success if he stands against his rival: however, he continues, there is nothing to be done without "bleeding" freely on these occasions. Don Quixote replies that he is not afraid of "blood" and that he will preserve the town from any insults. He wishes to know the knight whom he is going to fight. The mayor informs him that he stays now at Loveland Castle with 600 freeholders at his heels. Don Quixote now begins to denounce his adversary as a deflowerer of virgins, a debaucher of wives, whereupon the mayor, surprised, ventures to say that Sir Thomas Loveland, his rival is rather a good-natured and civil gentleman. He goes on to say that the whole is a matter of money and that he who spends the most will carry it. Don Quixote, on hearing this, starts up and calls him a caitiff. "Hence from my sight", he cries, "or by the peerless Dulcinea's eyes, thy blood shall pay the affront thou hast given my honour!"

Scene IV—VII.

Squire Badger and his huntsman Scut enter the room. Squire Badger wants some company. The innkeeper is very sorry not to be able to comply with his demand, the only guests of his being for the moment

a young lady and her maid, a madman and a squire. Then he tells Badger all he knows about Don Quixote and Sancho Pansa. Squire Badger is highly amused at his tale and wants to see the famous knight at once. Don Quixote is presented to him and having exchanged compliments with him, reveals him his secret that he has just discovered a beautiful princess in this castle. Squire Badger, who is very fond of music, invites his huntsman to entertain them with one of his hunting-songs. This song is remarkable for its beauty; it begins with the fine verse:

"The dusky night rides down the sky
And ushers in the morn
The hounds all join in glorious cry
The huntsman winds his horn."

Dorothea comes in and is introduced to Don Quixote by Squire Badger who calls her the finest woman in the world. Don Quixote, indignant at this preference given to another lady than his peerless Dulcinea, arises to protest against this abuse. He calls him a rascal; Squire Badger, in his turn, insults Don Quixote and a serious contest arises. At this moment Sancho comes to the rescue of his master, who has been badly treated by Squire Badger.

Scene VIII—XII.

Fairlove meets Squire Badger and wants to know the cause of his dispute with Don Quixote. Badger tells him all about when they hear from the court-yard a dreadful voice crying: "Avant, caitiff! think not, thou most accursed giant, ever to enter within this castle to bring any more captive princesses hither!" All inquire about the noise arising from the yard when Mrs Guzzle rushes in crying out for help. She tells them that Don Quixote won't suffer the stage-

coach to come into the yard. On arriving there, they see Don Quixote, armed cap-a-pie, his lance in his hand, standing before the gate. Nobody dares to approach him until Guzzle comes up and succeeds to open the gates.

Scene XIII—XIV.

The stage-coach enters the court-yard and Mr Brief, lawyier, Dr Drench, a physician and Mr Sneak with family alight from the carriage. As they are entering the house, they are welcomed by Don Quixote as most illustrious and high lords. He congratulates them upon their delivery and hopes they will repair immediately to Toboso to present their respects to his lady Dulcinea. The doctor and lawyier at once perceive the madness of Don Quixote and are discussing the best means to cure his insanity. Meanwhile Sancho is looking out for his master. He rather finds that knight-errantry is a dangerous profession; if it were not for the island his master had promised him, he would leave England at once. If ever he should happen to be governor of an island, he would do like other wise governors and plunder as much as possible.

Act III. Scene I—V.

Scene: A room.

Fairlove and his sweetheart Dorothea, Sancho and Mrs Guzzle admire the fine dress of Iezebel who is to represent the lady Dulcinea del Toboso before Don Quixote. Sancho says that he has never seen such gorgeous fine lady in all Toboso; he tells Iezebel that his master is informed of the approach of his mistress. All are longing for the moment to see Don Quixote receive his lady. In the meantime Sir Thomas Loveland, father of Dorothea, enters with

Mr Guzzle. Sir Thomas wants to see Squire Badger whom he considers a very advantageous match for his daughter considering the great estate he is told to possess. Squire Badger is presented to him and they exchange the usual compliments. Squire Badger tells of his merry London life; he says, if he had known as much of the world before, he would scarce have thought of marrying. He invites Sir Thomas to a „cherishing cup".

Scene VI—XIII.
Scene: The yard.

Don Quixote asks Sancho how far the advanced guards were yet from the castle and what knights attended to her presence. Sancho replies that he saw more than a dozen of rich coaches and a great number of maids of honour. As soon as Iezebel approaches, Don Quixote kneels down, addressing her as his most illustrious and mighty princess and expressing his thanks for the infinite goodness shown to him. Iezebel, all smiling, bids him to rise; she will be his eternally, provided she is assured of his constancy. At this moment Dorothea rushes in crying out for help, a mighty giant pursuing her. Don Quixote at once asks leave to protect her, while Sancho, fearing for his bones, is stealing away from the scene. Sir Thomas Loveland appears. Don Quixote, supposing him to be the giant, is on the point to attack him, when Dorothea, fearing for her father, throws herself between them and succeeds to calm the rage of Don Quixote. Sancho meanwhile has been in the pantry where he stuffs his belly as if he had never seen any food before. Though he likes English beef and pudding, he wants to get out of this cursed fighting

country. Mrs Guzzle is lamenting over the mischief done by Quixote. She says that the house is ruined for ever, that all windows are broken, her guests crying, swearing and stamping like dragoons.

Scene XIV—XVI.

Squire Badger, heated with wine, appears; he insults Sir Thomas whom he charges as a liar. He is not ashamed to ask Dorothea for a kiss. Don Quixote, seeing this, comes up to protect her. He addresses her father, Sir Thomas, beseeching him, not to confide his daughter to a man like Squire Badger. Dorothea confesses her father that she never loved and never would love Squire Badger, though he might be the richest man of the world. Squire Badger departs with new insults against Sir Thomas who finally sees the wrong he was doing to his daughter. He no more opposes the union of his daughter with Fairlove who is quite happy to carry home his sweetheart. Brief, the lawyer, enters; he says that he has been abused, beaten, hurt, disfigured and defaced by a rogue, rascal and villain. Dr Drench, on his side, declares his adversary to be a madman who should be blooded and cupped to cure him of his frenzy. The cook appears, haling in Sancho, who has been surprised stuffing his wallet with everything to be found in the kitchen, Don Quixote is ashamed of his squire and calls him a slave and a caitiff. Sir Thomas, however, says a few words in favour of poor Sancho and Fairlove is ready to pay Guzzle for all the mischief done by the squire and his illustrious master. Sir Thomas invites Don Quixote to his daughter's wedding and promises to do the best in his power for his entertainment. Dr Drench hopes, Sir Thomas won't take a madman

to his house. Don Quixote in his turn declares doctor and lawyer to be mad as well as himself, both living at the expense of honest people. The scene closes with the air:

"All mankind are mad, 'tis plain
Some for places
Some embraces
Some are mad to keep up gain
And others mad to spend it".

Since your madness is so plain
Each spectator
Of good nature
With applause will entertain
Don Quixote and Squire Sancho."

*c) Characters and Sources.*

However absurd in design or unfitted for the stage, Fielding's "Don Quixote in England" will nevertheless be found both readable and entertaining.

If Don Quixote and his trusty squire are not very felicitously introduced on English ground, yet their respective characters, as developed in Cervantes' romance, are admirably preserved.

Fielding's *Don Quixote* is the identical Don of the Spanish romance: the very soul of honour, a monomaniac, it is true, but a man of rare wit and wisdom. Whilst his acts are those of a madman, his language is that of a philosopher. He mistakes a pack of dogs for an army, but he denounces in no measured terms the social anomalies and vices which most revolt a chivalrous nature. He wages war, not only against giants and monsters, but against hypocrisy, servility, cunning and corruption. In fact, a happy mixture of sense and extravagance distinguishes the hero of the

comedy as well as of the romance. Take the following passage, in which the coarse characters and amusements of the country squires of the eighteenth century are felicitously satirised:

Don Quixote: "There is now arrived in this castle one of the most accursed giants that ever infested the earth. He marches at the head of his army that howl like Turks in an engagement".

Sancho: "Oh, lud! oh lud! this is the country squire at the head of his pack of dogs".

Quixote: "What dost thou mutter, varlet?"

Sancho: "Why, Sir, this giant, that your worship talks of, is a country gentleman going a-courting and his army is neither more nor less than his kennel of foxhounds."

Quixote: "Oh, the prodigious force of enchantment! Sirrah, I tell thee, this is the giant Toglogmoglog, lord of the island Gogmogog, whose belly hath been the tomb of above a thousand strong men."

Sancho: "Of above a thousand hogsheads of strong beer, I believe."

Quixote: "This must be the enchanter Merlin. I know him by his dogs. But thou idiot! dost thou imagine that women are to be hunted like hares, that a man would carry his hounds with him to visit his mistress?"

Sancho: "Sir, your true English squire and his hounds are as inseparable as the Spaniard and his Toledo. He eats with his hounds, drinks with his hounds, and lies with his hounds; your true errant English squire is but the first dog-boy in his house."

Quixote: "'Tis pity then that fortune should contradict the order of nature. It was a wise institution

of Plato to educate children according to their minds, not to their births; these squires should sow their corn which they ride over. Sancho, when I see a gentleman on his own coach-box, I regret the loss which some has had of a coachman; the man who toils all day after a partridge or a pheasant might serve his country by toiling after a plough; and when I see a low, mean, tricking lord, I lament the loss of an excellent attorney."

The character of Don Quixote himself is one of the most perfect disinterestedness. He is an enthusiast of the most amiable kind, of a nature equally open, gentle and generous, a lover of truth and justice and one who has brooded over the fine dreams of chivalry and romance, till they had robbed him of himself and cheated his brain into a belief of their reality.

The character of Sancho is admirable in itself, but still more as a relief to that of the knight. The contrast is as picturesque and striking as that between the figures of Don Quixote's steed and Sancho's ass. Never was there so complete a "partie quarrée": they answer to one another at all points. Nothing need surpass the truth of physiognomy in the description of the master and man, both as to body and mind: the one lean and tall, the other round and short; the one heroical and courteous, the other selfish and servile; the one full of high-flown fancies, the other a bag of proverbs; the one always starting some romantic scheme, the other trying to the safe side of custom and tradition. The gradual ascendancy, however, obtained by Don Quixote over Sancho, is as finely managed as it is characteristic. Credulity and

a love of the marvellous are as natural to ignorance as selfishness and cunning.

Don Quixote is not merely to be regarded as a Spanish cavalier, filled with a Spanish madness and introduced on English ground — he is also the type of a more universal madness — he is the symbol of imagination, continually struggling and contrasted with reality. He represents the eternal warfare between enthusiasm and necessity, the eternal discrepancy between the aspirations and the occupations of man, the omnipotence and the vanity of human dreams.

Cervantes' design in writing his famous romance has been, as he says himself at the very beginning of his work, to break down the vogue and authority of books of chivalry. Fielding's object in writing his comedy was to give "a lively representation of the calamities brought on a country by general corruption." As will be pointed ont in the following chapter, Fielding did not succeed in his enterprise. However, the election scenes, in which Don Quixote is brought into contact with the corrupt rulers of the borough, which he is solicited to stand for as a candidate, exhibit a dramatic skill and humour which few of English comic writers have excelled. These scenes, though but slightly attached to the main story, are keenly satirical and considering that Hogarth's famous series of kindred prints belongs to a much later date, must certainly have been novel, as may be gathered from the following little colloquy between M$^{r}$ Mayor and M$^{essrs}$ Guzzle and Retail:

Mayor (to Retail): . . . "I like an opposition, because otherwise a man may be obliged to vote against his party; therefore, when we invite a gent-

leman to stand, we invite him to spend his money for the honour of his party; and when both parties have spent as much as they are able, every honest man will vote according to his conscience.

Guzzle: "Mr Mayor talks like a man of sense and honour and it does me good to hear him."

Mayor: „Ay, ay, Mr Guzzle, I never gave a vote contrary to my conscience. I have earnestly recommended the country interest to all my brethren, but before that I recommended the town-interest, that is the interest of this corporation, and first of all I recommended to every particular man to take a particular care of himself. And it is with a certain way of reasoning, that he who serves me best, will serve the town best and he that serves the town best, will serve the country best."

Fielding was anxious to maintain as much as possible the characters of Don Quixote and Sancho as they are present to us in Cervantes' romance. However, to delineate the character of Don Quixote was no easy task for Fielding, as he could hardly hope to reach his model. And still, we dare say, he has made the best of it. As in the romance, the hero suffers only of partial madness; his fantastical love for Dulcinea, his imaginary ideas of enchanters, kings and princesses are a result of his enthusiasm for knight-errantry. All actions and discourses are therefore, however absurd they may be, the logical outcome of his fixed ideas. As to the rest, he is very reasonable and has a deep insight in human nature, to put to shame even those who assume to possess a good deal of common sense and sound judgment. Act III, Scene 14, affords a very good instance of it. Don Quixote is

quite indignant at Sir Thomas' behaviour who intends to give his daughter to the rich but heartless Squire Badger rather than to accept poor honest Fairlove, whose love is shared by Dorothea. "Do you", he addresses Sir Thomas," marry your daughter for her sake or your own? If for hers, sure it is something whimsical to make her miserable in order to make her happy. Money is a thing well worth considering in these affairs, but parents always regard it too much and lovers too little. No match can be happy, which love and fortune do not conspire to make so."

The source of this scene is very likely Molière's "Avare" (Act I, Scene 7), where Valère says: . . . "Il y a des gens qui pourraient vous dire qu'en de telles occasions l'inclination d'une fille est une chose, sans doute, où l'on doit avoir de l'égard . . . Ce n'est pas qu' il n'y ait quantité de pères qui aimeraient mieux ménager la satisfaction de leurs filles que l'argent qu'ils pourraient donner et qui ne les voudraient point sacrifier à l'intérêt . . . ."

All this clearly shows that Don Quixote is in every respect a high-minded man and we fully adhere to the opinion of Sir Thomas Loveland, when he says: "I don't know whether this knight, by and by, may not prove us all to be more mad than himself." (Act III, Scene XVI).

Don Quixote's fantastical design was to reestablish in his own person knight-errantry with all its merits and defects. In his brain the imaginary adventures and noble deeds of an Amadis and other heroes were taking shape as of flesh and blood. Once we have fully acknowledged this fact, we perfectly understand that he takes guests arriving at

the inn as giants or knights, that he sees in Dorothea an enchanted princess, that he believes that Jezebel, Dorothea's maid, is his beloved Dulcinea del Toboso, that he attacks a stage-coach and smashes the windows to pieces in order to deliver the enchanted captive princesses.

As to *Sancho*, he is the same fainthearted, greedy and indolent fellow as in Cervantes' romance. Like his prototype he has a certain predilection for Don Quixote, hoping to be finally rewarded with the promised island; he also expresses his realistic opinions in floods of proverbs. He is somewhat infected by the partial madness of his master, but his ideas are on the whole very rational and full of common sense. Almost every feature of Sancho's character is traced from the original. There is only one action not to be found in the original: Sancho's robbery in the last scene of the 3d act.

Fielding has succeeded very well in introducing the famous knight and his squire on English ground, with the object to ridicule English vices and corrupted manners. He could not do it better than by showing that people of world and manners, the very representatives of their class, were even inferior in reasonable judgment and noble feeling to a man who by all the world was looked upon as a madman.

*Squire Badger* too, a rudimentary Squire Western, is vigorously drawn. The song of his huntsman Scut (act II, scene V), beginning with the fine line "The dusky night rides down the sky" has a verse that recalls a practice of which Addison accuses Sir Roger de Coverley ("The Spectator" 1711—12):

"A brushing fox in yonder wood
Secure to find we seek;
For why, I carry'd sound and good
A cartload there last week.
. . . . And a-hunting we will go" etc.

From the history of the stage it appears that Macklin, Fielding's partner, when starting a new company at the Haymarket, was very successful in acting Squire Badger. This figure must have been quite popular with Englishmen, for in 1772 a certain Dr Arne brought out a burletta "Squire Badger" with music composed by himself. This play, whose characters and design are taken from Fielding's "Don Quixote in England" was reacted in 1775 under the title of "The Sot".

*Guzzle* is a copy of Cervantes' landlord in chapter 16 ff. of the 1st part; he shows the same irritation at Don Quixote's refusal not to pay his debts.

*Dorothea* reminds us that she bears the same name as the girl whose story is narrated in the Ist part of the romance.

*Sir Thomas Loveland* ant *the mayor*, as well as Squire Badger, are quite original figures of Fielding and exhibit his rising power of delineating characters. They are the first step to his development as a painter of characters which we admire in his great novels "Tom Jones", "Joseph Andrews" and "Amelia". Already in his dramatical pieces, written in the first part of his life, we find Fielding a keen observer of English life and manners and we cannot follow his literary career without studying these dramas.

G. Becker in his "Aufnahme des Don Quijote in die englische Literatur" (Palaestra XIII, pag. 129) thinks that Fielding's Don Quixote has still more

affinity with Molière's "Misanthrope" than with Cervantes' work. Fielding's hero is, like Molière's Alceste, the only moral person in a corrupted society where selfishness reigns instead of truth and justice.

Fielding's Don Quixote, compared with Beaumont and Fletcher's "The Knight of the Burning Pestle" and D'Urfey's "Comical History of Don Quixote" marks a real progress: Don Quixote is no more a comical figure, but a serious dramatical character; the action is conform to his character.

The weak side of the drama are the many episodes which serve to put the hero in contrast to the other characters of the comedy.

Fielding's comedy, though well written, is ill calculated for the stage, because mere knight-errantry without spectacle never had success upon the English theatre. Mr Dibdin, in his "History of the Stage" (vol. V, p. 43) says: "If Fielding had carried Don Quixote to any other part of the world and introduced a few elephants or camels and made him fight half a dozen tigers, and had decorated the stage with castles that lose their battlements in the air, about fifteen feet from the ground, the whole an outrage upon nature and art, the redoubted knight, as mad as his audiences, might have acted every species of extravagance to the admiration of full houses".

## VI.

## Fielding and Walpole.

The first time in Fielding's life we hear of Sir Robert Walpole, is in 1730, when Fielding addresses a poetical epistle to the prime-minister. In this rymed petition Fielding makes pleasant mirth of what no doubt was sometimes sober truth — his debts, his duns and his dinnerless condition. So he says in one of his verses (cf. Miscellanies, vol. I. p. 42):

"The family that dines the latest
Is in our street esteemed the greatest,
But latest hours must surely fall
Before him who never dines at all."

— — — — — — — —

"This too does in my favour speak
Your Levée is but twice a week
From mine I can exclude but one day
My door is quiet on a Sunday."

In 1731 Fielding dedicated one of his plays „The Modern Husband" to Walpole, in whom he recognised, amongst other more plausible characters, a "foster-son of the Muses".

With regard to Walpole's character in private and public life, Chesterfield says in his "Characters of eminent personages of his own time" (Appendix to Miscellaneous Works p. 31 ff.): "In private life he was

good-natured, cheerful, social, inelegant in his manners, loose in his morals; he had a coarse strong wit, which he was too free of for a man in his station, as it is always inconsistent with dignity. He was very able as minister, but without a certain elevation of mind, necessary for great good or great mischief. Profuse and appetent, his ambition was subservient to his design of making a great fortune (Walpole did not die a rich man; it is plain then that he disdained the accumulation of riches which could not be obtained but by the oppression of his country). He had more of the Mazarin than of the Richelieu — he would do mean things for profit and never thought of doing great ones for glory. He was both the best parliament-man and the ablest manager of parliament that I believe ever lived. Money, not prerogative, was the chief engine of his administration and he employed it with a success, which in a manner disgraced humanity. Besides this powerful engine of government, he had a most extraordinary talent of persuading and working men up to his purpose — a hearty kind of frankness, which sometimes seemed imprudence, made people think that he led them into his secrets, whilst the impoliteness of his manners seemed to attest his sincerity. He was loved by many, but respected by none, his familiar and illiberal mirth and raillery leaving him no dignity. He was not vindictive but on the contrary very placable to those who had injured him the most. His good humour, good nature and beneficence in the several relations of father, husband, master and friend, gained him the warmest affections of all within that circle. His name will not be recorded in history amongst the best men

or the best ministers, but much less ought it to be ranked amongst the worst."

In 1734 Fielding wrote his "Don Quixote in England", in which — as he tells Lord Chesterfield in his dedication — he designed to give a lively representation of the calamaties brought on a country by general corruption."

The opposition to Walpole was gathering strength. No opposition arrayed against a powerful ministry ever included a larger share of the talents of the country, both political and literary, than that which opposed the later years of Walpole's authority. Pope and Swift, Johnson and Fielding, Glover and Akenside may be counted as sympathising for various reasons with the opposition. Walpole was regarded as the centre of all corruption and men fancied that the overthrow of his power would of itself instil purity to the political body. But the system of government was far too deeply rooted to be dependent upon one man's power. It is true that Walpole was the conspicuous representative of that system of which Fielding's Mayor and Corporation (cf. Act II, Scene III) were a natural product, that is to say, of a system in which the governing classes themselves formed something like a close corporation for the distribution of places and powers, not very sensitive to a healthy public opinion and with very shortsighted views of anything beyond immediate commercial profit.

In the "Pasquin" (1736) Fielding pursues the theme already suggested in "Don Quixote in England" and gives a forcible description of a contested election, a new attack upon corruption. His next comedy, "The Historical Register for 1736" proved a much bolder

and more objectionable performance even than "Pasquin" and its representation led to important consequences as regarded the interests and independence of the stage. Sir Robert Walpole himself was introduced in the piece under the name of "Quidam", silencing some noisy patriots with a bribe and then dancing off with them.

The frank effrontery of satire like the foregoing had by this time begun to attract the attention of the Ministry and it has been conjectured that the ballet of Quidam and the Patriots played no small part in precipitating the famous "Licensing Act", which was passed a few weeks afterwards. About this time Giffard, the manager of Goodman's Fields, brought Walpole a farce called „The Golden Rump"[1]) which had been proposed for exhibition. Whether he did this to extort money or to ask advice, is not clear. In either case, Walpole is said to have "paid the profits which might have accrued from the performance and detained the copy". He then made a compendious selection of the treasonable and profane passages it contained. These he submitted to independent members of both parties and afterwards

[1]) "The Golden Rump" has never been printed, although its title is identical with that of a caricature published in March 1737 and fully described in the "Gentleman's Magazine" for that month. If the play at all resembled the design, it must have been obscene and scurrilous in the extreme. Horace Walpole in his "Memoirs of the last ten years of the reign of George II" says: „I have in my possession the imperfect copy of this piece as I found it among my father's papers after his death." He calls it Fielding's, but no importance can be attached to the statement. There is a copy of the caricature in the British Museum Print Room (Political and Personal Satires No 23271).

read them in the House itself. The result was that by way of amendment to the "Vagrant Act" of Anne's reign a bill was prepared limiting the number of theatres and compelling all dramatic writers to obtain a license from the Lord Chamberlain.

It is alleged that Walpole himself caused the farce in question to be written and to be offered to Giffard for the purpose of introducting his scheme of reform; and the suggestion is not without a certain plausibility. Meanwhile the new bill passed rapidly through both Houses. Report speaks of animated discussions and warm opposition, but there are no traces of any divisions or petitions against it and the only speech which has survived is the very elaborate and careful oration delivered in the Upper House by Lord Chesterfield. He opposed the bill upon the ground that it would affect the liberty of the press and that it was practically a tax upon the chief property of men of letters, their wit. He dwelt also upon the value of the stage as a fearless censor of vice and folly and he quoted with excellent effect the famous answer of the Prince of Conti to Molière, when "Tartuffe" was interdicted at the instance of M. de Lamoignon: "It is true, Molière, Harlequin ridicules Heaven and exposes religion, but you have done much worse — you have ridiculed the first minister of religion". Although in Lord Chesterfield's speech Fielding is ironically condemned, it may well be that Fielding, whose "Don Quixote" had been dedicated to his Lordship, was the wire-puller in this case and supplied this very illustration. But the feeling of Parliament in favour of drastic legislation was even stronger than the persuasive periods of Chester-

field, and on the 21st of June 1737 the bill received the royal assent.

With the passing of the "Licensing Act" Fielding's career as a dramatic author was practically closed. In his dedication of the "Historical Register" to the public, he had spoken of his desire to beautify and enlarge his little theatre and to procure a better company of actors and he had added: "If nature has given me any talents at ridiculing vice and imposture, I shall not be indolent, nor afraid of exerting them, while the liberty of the press and stage subsists, that is to say, while we have any liberty left among us." To all these projects the "Licensing Act" effectively put an end and the only other plays from his pen which were produced subsequently to this date were "The Wedding Day" (1743) and the posthumous "Good-natured Man" (1779), both of which, as is plain from the Preface to the Miscellanies, were among his earliest attempts.

## VII.

## Fielding's attempt as a dramatical writer.

An ingenious English writer has passed a judgment upon Ben Jonson, which may be justly applied to Fielding, though our great novelist did not attain the same dramatic eminence as the author of "Volpone the Fox". "His taste for ridicule", he says, "was strong, but indelicate, which made him not overcurious in the choice of his topics. And lastly, his style in picturing his characters, thoug masterly, was without that elegance of hand which is required to correct and allay the force of so bold a colouring. Thus the bias of his nature leading him to Plautus rather than Terence for his model, it is not to be wondered that his wit is too frequently caustic, his raillery coarse and his humour excessive".

Arthur Murphy, Fielding's friend and first biographer, attributes his failure as a dramatist to his want of refinement. "Without a tincture of delicacy", he says, "running through an entire piece and giving to good sense an air of urbanity and politeness, it appears to me, that no comedy will ever be of that kind, which Horace says will be particularly desired".

There seems to be little or no doubt that this want of refinement was principally owing to the woundings which every fresh dissappointment gave him, before he was yet well disciplined in the school of life; for in a more advanced period with a calmer and more dispassionate temper, we perceive him giving all the graces of description to incidents and passions, which in his youth he would have dashed out with a rougher hand. Perhaps the asperity of Fielding's muse was not little encouraged by the practice of two great wits who had fallen into the same vein before him: Wycherley and Congreve, who were in general painters of harsh features, attached more to subjects of deformity than grace. These two writers were not fond of copying the amiable part of life; they had not learned the secret of giving the softer graces of composition to their pictures by contrasting the fair and beautiful in characters and manners to the vicious and irregular and thereby rendering their pieces more exact imitations of nature.

There is another circumstance respecting the drama, in which Fielding's judgment seems to have failed him: the strength of his genius certainly lay in fabulous narration and he did not sufficiently consider that some incidents of a story, which, when related, may be worked up into a deal of pleasantry and humour, are apt, when thrown into action, to excite sensations incompatible with humour and ridicule. To these causes of our author's failure in the province of the drama, may be added that sovereign contempt he always entertained for the understandings of the generality of mankind. It was in vain to tell him that a particular scene was dangerous on account

of its coarseness or because it retarded the general business with feeble efforts of wit; he doubted the discernment of his auditors and so thought himself secured by their stupidity, if not by his own humour and vivacity.

These are the principal causes of Fielding's failure in dramatical composition. And yet, it would be injust to deny that even his plays show a certain tendency to progress. A continual improvement is to be stated in his comedies as well as in his novels. The mere fact that his plays are the first step to the accomplishment of his famous novels, renders them interesting and valuable to the literary world. The whole of his dramatical productions may be justly compared to a collection of episodes of a great novel representing all classes of the society of his time. Hence the great affinity of characters and situations in his plays and novels. — However, Fielding has never attained the height of Molières "Misanthrope" and "Tartuffe". In many plays of the later period he has entirely freed himself from the influence of Wycherley, Congreve and the French school and only his predilection and eminent talent for the novel has prevented him from climbing the highest pitch of dramatical perfection. Still, his productions are on the whole very good, considering the bad conditions of the stage at this time. They certainly have contributed a good deal to the improvement of the taste and manners of his contemporaries. Each of his plays has some good scene and all exhibit a profound knowledge of human nature. They give a splendid description of the vices and virtues of men; they are singularly efficient by their delineation of

characters, the comic of their situations and their humour. We remark with pleasure that all this is the spontaneous expression of his inmost thoughts and feelings. Without possessing the grace and elegance of Addison and Goldsmith or the lightness and vivacity of Lesage, Fielding was master of a vigorous manly and truly English style, though occasionally incorrect. His most remarkable peculiarity is the constant employment of "hath" and "doth" for "has" and "does". This occurs, as far as I know, in no other writer of the eighteenth century.

One of Fielding's most remarkable qualities in playwriting is his *satire.*

In no other play is Fielding's satire so manifest as in "The Tragedy of Tragedies" or "*The Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great*".

This tragedy, acted in 1730 and altered in 1731, is supposed to be written by H. Scriblerus Secundus whose annotations to the play are of great literary interest. Fielding has never written a better satire on the "hoity-toity tone of the tragedy of that day", as Lawrence says in his biography (p. 35). It may be considered a worthy continuation of Buckingham's „Rehearsal" (1671), being directed as well against Dryden's later productions (still more French than his earlier ones) as its numerous imitations by different authors. Even at the time of Fielding Dryden's style was still admired by many and we perfectly understand that Fielding wished to have done with this so-called classical style of a very doubtful merit.

As we may guess by the annotations annexed to the play, the most important tragedies aimed at are:

Banks: Earl of Essex, Cyrus the Great, Mary Queen of Scots, Anna Bullen, Virtue betrayed.

Dennis: Liberty asserted.

Dryden: State of Innocence, Don Sebastian, Aurengzebe, Cleomenes, Duke of Guise, Conquest of Granada, Albion, King Arthur, Indian Emperor, All for love, Love triumphant.

Johnson: Victim.

Lee: Sophonisbe, Lucius Junius Brutus, Gloriana, Mithridates, Caesar Borgia, Nero, Duke of Guise.

Otway: Marius, Don Carlos.

Rowe: Bajazet.

Tate: Injured love.

Young: Busiris, Revenge.

The principal characters of „The Tragedy of Tragedies" are properly described in the dramatis personae: Tom Thumb the Great, a little hero with a great soul, something violent in his temper which is a little abated by his love for Huncamunca; Princess Huncamunca, daughter to their majesties King Arthur and Queen Dollallolla, of a very sweet, gentle and amorous disposition, equally in love with Lord Grizzle and Tom Thumb, and desirous to be married to them both.

The spring of all this is the love of Tom Thumb for Huncamunca which caused the quarrel between their majesties in the first act, the passion of Lord Grizzle in the second act, the rebellion, fall of Lord Grizzle and Glumdalca, devouring of Tom Thumb by the cow and the bloody catastrophe in the third act.

Aristotle, according to Dryden, defines tragedy to be the imitation of a short but perfect action, containing a just greatness in itself. Scriblerus secundus however tells us that the greatest perfection of the

language of a tragedy is that it is not to be understood; which granted, it will necessarily follow that the only way to avoid this is by being too high or too low for the understanding. What can be, he continues, so proper for tragedy as a set of big sounding words, so contrived together as to convey no meaning?

Fielding succeeds to ridicule the authors by imitating them ironically. I don't think that the great public so easily understood what he really meant — many of his contemporaries actually believed in his extravagancies.

The catastrophe of the tragedy (act III, scene 10) is a fine parody of Dryden's "Cleomenes". In „Cleomenes" the curtain covers five principal characters dead on the stage; in "Tom Thumb" there is a general slaughter, all actors killing one another, the king, as the last, killing himself with the words:

"So when the child whom nurse from danger guards,
Sends Jack for mustard with a pack of cards,
Kings, queens, and knaves, throw one another down,
Till the whole pack lies scatter'd and o'erthrown;
So all our pack upon the floor is cast,
And all I boast is — that I fall the last."

To Dryden's statement ("Essay on dramatic poetry"): . . . . "Our countrymen will scarcely suffer combats and other objects of horror to be taken from them" Fielding remarks sarcastically: . . . . "Nor do I believe our victories over the French have been owing to anything more than to those bloody spectacles daily exhibited in our tragedies, of which the French stage is so entirely clear" (Scriblerus Secundus' annotations).

Fielding not only satirizes the contents but also the form of the heroic tragedies, so when he wants to ridicule the alliterations too often used by those tragedians:

Act I, scene 6:

"I'll rave, I'll rant, I'll rise, I'll rush, I'll roar"

Act II, scene 7:

"Tempests and whirlwinds rise, and roll and roar".

The similes, in imitation of the ancients, are remarkable by their humour. Act I, scene 2 affords a very good example, the king inquiring about the queen's melancholy:

"Whence flow those tears fast down thy blubber'd [cheeks
Like a swoln gutter, gushing through the streets?"

or in act I, scene 3, where Glumdalca laments the loss of her twenty husbands:

"My worn out heart
That ship, leaks fast, and the great heavy lading,
My soul, will quickly sink".

A parody of ghosts as they frequently occur with Dryden and his followers, is act III, scene 1, the ghost of Tom Thumb's father appearing to King Arthur:

"Hail! ye black horrors of midnight's midnoon!
Ye fairies, goblins, bats, and screech-owls, hail!
And oh! ye mortal watchmen, whose hoarse throats
Th' immortal ghosts dread croakings counterfeit,
All hail! — Ye dancing phantoms, who, by day
Are some condemn'd to fast, some feast in fire,
Now play in churchyards, skipping o'er the graves,
To the loud music of the silent bell,
All hail!"

Fielding's "Tom Thumb", certainly one of his best dramas, was a great success, the play being acted forty nights without interruption. Walter Scott asserts that still at his time "Tom Thumb" was read with delight and even Lawrence states that in 1855, more than hundred years after the play had been written, "The Tragedy of Tragedies" still kept possession of the stage.

Fielding's plays are of a real historical interest, as they reproduce, as well as his novels, the conditions of the different classes of society in the first half of the eighteenth century.

Fielding deserves well of his country, as he was one of the first to ridicule the stupid imitation of French manners and customs in England, at a time when French vice and superficiality were spreading all over the United Kingdom. He not only repudiated foreign vices but fought energetically against all sorts of evil inclinations likely to delay the development of national English life. Not the secret toleration of these evils seemed to him true patriotism, but the open war against everything that was vile and mean. Many prologues and epilogues to his plays contain passages entreating his fellow-countrymen to return to plain English life and to look to their own heroes as the worthiest and best. So he says in the epilogue to "Pasquin":

"Can the whole world in science match our soil?
Have they a Locke, a Newton or a Boyle?
Or dare the greatest genius of their stage
With Shakespeare or immortal Ben engage?"

Fielding's plays had but temporary success, because they had been written only for his time and

his contemporaries. As far as he could do it without giving offence to his moral sense, Fielding followed the taste of his time. Of course, if he had acted otherwise, he would have lost his favour with the public, and his constant efforts to instruct and elevate the masses would have been all in vain He often complains of the preference given to the Italian opera, so in his epilogue to the "The Intriguing Chamber-Maid", where he says:

"English is now below this learned town
None but Italian warblers will go down
Though courts were more polite, the English ditty
Could heretofore content the city:
That for Italian now has let us drop
And Dimi Cara rings through every shop
What glorious thoughts must all our neighbours [nourish
Of us, where rival operas can flourish."

Another protest against this kind of entertainments was his farce "Tumble Down Dick." The stage-writer of those days was a knave to the public opinion; to please the public, he had to write prologues and epilogues to each of his plays. It was no use protesting against this custom of the Restoration-period: Fielding had to comply with if he wanted to live on the stage. But his prologues and epilogues, as well as his dedications are no disguised adulations so common in those days, but moderate and worthy addresses to the public, his friends and protectors.

If our poet sometimes goes too far in making concessions to public taste, he never forgets his higher design to show his contemporaries a mirror of their vices. This ranges Fielding high above all his fellow-

playwriters; going through his comedies we soon discover that with regard to morals and esthetics he far surpasses Wycherley and Congreve, his masters of old.

In this noble design he was the true follower of Molière. Like the immortal author of "Tartuffe" he "scoffed at vice and laughed its crimes away" to show his countrymen the true path of humanity and to prepare the way to new ideals, to a higher standard of life.

---

Zum Schlusse spreche ich

Herrn Professor Dr. MÜLLER-HESS

für sein freundliches Entgegenkommen bei Ausführung dieser Arbeit meinen wärmsten Dank aus.